

MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
SPECIAL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2017 7:10 P.M.

Members Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Mayor Raymond Rogina; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Development; Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager; Matthew O'Rourke, Economic Development Manager; Chris Bong, Development Engineering Division Manager; Fire Chief Schelstreet; Asst. Chief Christensen; Chris Minick, Director of Finance; Peter Suhr; Director of Public Works

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was convened by Chairman Bancroft at 8:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

Absent: None.

3. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- a. Recommendation to Approve a Commercial Corridor and Downtown Business Economic Incentive Award for 201 & 203 S. Third Street and request to Commence Improvements in Fiscal Year 2016/17 with Reimbursement of Funds Contingent upon approval of the City's Fiscal Year 2017/18 Budget.

Mr. O'Rourke said this would be a tier 2 level grant and there are a number of improvements required in the building to help facilitate the owner, Mr. Tom Staroske, locating West Valley Graphics & Print into their facility. Upgrades include electric service both inside the building and through the building, replacement of mechanical equipment such as the furnace and air conditioning units, enhancements to the metering and the gas system is a little outdated, as well as some plumbing upgrades and a new exterior door to make it accessible to the street. The second part to this proposal is that in order to help facilitate this new tenant, there is a timing issue where they are being asked to leave the facility they are currently in, and unfortunately all the budget amount for this program has already been committed to other projects this year, so there are no funds for this project from this fiscal year. Mr. Staroske is asking if he could make the improvements now during this fiscal year with the funds being allocated into the next fiscal year; basically the money that's planned to be budgeted, he'd be able to use that and he wouldn't actually propose any repayment until the next fiscal year which starts May 1st and he understands, per conversation with staff, that this would be at his own risk should anything happen to the budget as far as funds not being approved. The real reason for this is the timing issues created that

our program currently doesn't allow the applicant to make any of the improvements before they're approved by Council.

Mr. Staroske-506 Bradley Circle- Said everything seems to be coming to head because the prospective tenant-West Valley Graphics-who has been in town for 30+ years would like to relocate into that building. However, he has been told by his landlord that he needs to get out of that building by the end of March, he also has many equipment leases that are all expiring and he would like to relocate the new equipment into his place. He said the dress shop that was there didn't succeed but Bill has expressed his interest to move in but it has to be done immediately so he cannot really wait until the next fiscal year and maybe not even get started until June, he really needs to move forward with it to hopefully get some reimbursement from the 2017/2018 budget.

**Aldr. Krieger left before the motion was made.*

Aldr. Stellato made a motion to approve a Commercial Corridor and Downtown Business Economic Incentive Award for 201 & 203 S. Third Street and request to Commence Improvements in Fiscal Year 2016/17 with Reimbursement of Funds Contingent upon approval of the City's Fiscal Year 2017/18 Budget. Seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 8-0

- b. Plan Commission recommendation to approve a Special Use for PUD and PUD Preliminary Plan for Prairie Center.

Mr. Colby said at the Feb. 13, 2017 meeting the Committee reviewed the application and at the meeting, staff noted there were a number of open items regarding the PUD ordinance draft that were not yet resolved. The Committee directed staff and the developer to attempt to resolve the outstanding items and provide an update tonight. In terms of the preliminary plan review staff has completed review of the recent engineering plan submittal, there are a few items to be resolved on that preliminary plan prior to City Council approval, including some comments regarding the watermain layout, which staff and developer are working to resolve those issues. If the committee does make a recommendation on the project tonight, staff would ask that a condition be placed on the recommendation that any of those outstanding plan review comments be addressed before final Council action on the project. In terms of the PUD ordinance draft, there is a memo in the packet summarizing the status of the ordinance as well as a complete draft of the ordinance included. At this time one item remains unresolved, which is related to the affordable units, as was presented previously the developer requested a variance to permit all of the affordable units to be located in one or more buildings, as opposed to being distributed throughout the site; that variance initially, as requested, would have applied to any type of affordable unit, not just senior. In response to the Committee discussion last week, the developer has agreed to only apply that location variance to a senior affordable unit and the ordinance has been written that way. The developer is now requesting a 3 year period after the approval of the project to begin construction on the senior affordable units and then after that 3 year period, if the project is not constructed, the developer would like the ability to pay a fee in-lieu payment instead of providing the affordable units. Staff and the developer have not agreed on how this fee in-lieu would be calculated; the developer proposed that it would be either the lesser of \$5,000 per unit which is the current fee set this evening, or the existing fee at the time. So it would be either \$5,000 or less if it were less 3 years after the approval when this timeframe has lapsed. Staff suggested that it be worded so that it would be the greater of either \$5,000 or whatever the fee is 3 years from now. Ultimately the fee could be frozen at the current rate if that was something that committee supported, and for a total of 61 affordable units that would be fee in-lieu payment of \$305,000.

Peter Bazos-Elgin-Attorney representing Shodeen Group-said there have been many meetings since we began this process and many meetings with staff and they really appreciate Mr. Koenen, Mr. Colby and Ms. Tungare. There have been a lot of compromises through this whole process, one of those being the variance for putting all affordable units would only apply to senior housing here. During the 3 Plan Commission public hearings, and then a 4th final meeting, it was made pretty clear to us that the most desired type of affordable project would be a senior affordable project. So Shodeen went out and found a senior housing developer that is a very reputable and experienced developer, and has in fact entered into a contract with them for 2 of the building sites by the northwest corner of the site near Prairie St. Those type of senior affordable projects have become affordable because the buyer applies to the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) for an award of tax credits, which each state gets through the IRS and then is allocated as they see fit as to which city needs more affordable housing, which doesn't and which project looks the best. This senior developer is going to be applying to IHDA for tax credits in this first round and it's very common that a developer doesn't get awarded in the first round and then has to wait for the next round, and sometimes not all applicants ever get the award. So it's not a certainty, even though we have a very qualified buyer, that this buyer will be able to get not only the tax credits but then find the buyer for tax credits as well as bank financing, but the reason Shodeen selected this group is because they have been successful. This could take anywhere from 1-3 years for this buyer to tell us that they have gotten what they need and are ready to close, they've seen the architecture that the Committee has specified and are agreeable to all of that, but now they need all this financing. Mr. Patzelt has agreed that in the PUD Ordinance that for a period of 3 years he will hold open this particular site that this buyer is interested in for nothing but the senior project, and at the end of that 3 year period this senior project has been unable to go forward at that point we'd like to then be able to pay a fee in-lieu and develop the project for the PUD plan that's been seen. We think its inherently unfair to have the developer be exposed after agreeing to wait for this 3 year period to try and encourage this senior project that the city has indicated they would really like to see. To be exposed to whatever the fee in-lieu might be then, you've just acted to reduce your fee in-lieu from \$72,000 to \$5,000 per unit and at the required 61 units times \$72,000 is \$4.4million or under the just enacted fee of \$5,000 is \$305,000, that's a \$4 million dollar swing and who knows what it will be in 3 years. We just think it's a risk that the developer cannot agree to take and we are hoping that committee will agree that in exchange for this developer reserving this project for 3 years for a senior project, that if the senior cannot come to fruition, that the fee in-lieu approved tonight be applicable; they feel its basic fairness and hope that Committee will agree.

Chairman Bancroft asked for confirmation from staff on a few things for the Committee. With respect to anything that is outstanding for this project, staff would comfortable with an approval or recommendation from this Committee that is subject to satisfaction of outstanding staff comments; that everything else really has been addressed and there is nothing lurking out there. Mr. Colby said correct, for all of the major terms listed in the memo, staff has reached an agreement with the developer. Chairman Bancroft said there's fee in-lieu and affordable units to satisfy our IHO and his read of the statute is that it's at the Council's pleasure whether or not to accept a fee in-lieu to satisfy the IHO. Mr. McGuirk said that's correct, although whatever we end up with in this negotiated PUD we'd be bound by it. Chairman Bancroft said a PUD is an agreement and that's what the developer is putting forth, and part of that agreement to date has been the delivery of the senior housing component and they are 100% correct, the fee was reduced in the interim, and from his own perspective he doesn't know if that had any bearing on the agreement because it was never part of the agreement. He then opened it up for discussion.

Aldr. Silkaitis said we just talked about this whole project at length last week and there is nothing about a change in affordable housing units, so he's a little confused there. Second, this was a good way to actually have affordable units in St. Charles; collecting money is great, but this is a place where units can actually be built, so he is not in favor of this at all. All this time we talked about building

affordable housing and the developer would get his bonus, and not 1 week later the whole situation is changing and he can't go along with this, he wants the actual affordable housing units built, or else he won't support it.

Aldr. Payleitner asked if there were a 5 year build out on this project. David Patzelt-Shodeen Group-77 N. First St., Geneva-said he sees this as a 10 year build out. Aldr. Payleitner said 3 years out of a 10 year project, she would like it taken out as well as Aldr. Silkaitis said, and then if need be in 3 years, 5 years or 10 years, she still thinks after 3 years, if the senior deal falls through unfortunately, but perhaps there will be another opportunity in the course of the remaining 7 years of the project to put in affordable housing someplace else. She said she would not want this added in and perhaps there's an option, because we have done it before in the last month, to change the PUD if need be to accommodate should the senior project fall through, to maybe then decide what our next step would be, not to do it upfront but to change the PUD later.

Aldr. Gaugel asked for clarification on the 3 year duration, he thought it was presented as if nobody comes forward and wants to develop that senior portion over a course of 3 years, then there's the option to do the fee in-lieu, and he wondered if Shodeen decides if what's brought forward is appropriate. He said say there are 3-4 different developers who come forward, does Shodeen have carte blanche to say yes or no to that, or is there any stipulations on what's appropriate to do that. Mr. Patzelt said we are currently under contract with GC Development; that is good for 2-2.5 years and in that time period they have the right to close and develop their product, however they have told us that in order to go forward and provide this product they have to get IHDA approval. So if today or in the next 2 years IHDA decides they don't want to work with GC Development, technically they are still under contract and have the right to close and build their product on the property. However, they have a right to back out over these next 2-2.5 years in the event they don't get the IHDA tax credits; in the meantime if somebody else came along and wanted to put affordable units on those 2 pads, he couldn't sell those because it's under contract with GC Development. He said another difficulty that we have in the PUD is supporting the affordable housing rules; once we reach 30% of the market rate units, we have to start deploying, once we hit 50% of the 609, we have to have at least 30% of the 61 units of affordable, so if that requirement is kept in there and we get to 49% of the market rate housing and we have none on board, the project is dead. Aldr. Payleitner said with a 10 year project that's 5 years down the road and guessing they'd be at 49%, that's 3 years we can revisit this. Mr. Bazos said those first units would be built without any affordable units hoping that the senior units come through, but if they fall through then you do the scattered units.

Aldr. Gaugel said if the IHDA approval is given will they build it, or is there still a chance they wouldn't build if they get the IHDA approval. Mr. Patzelt said there are several different steps; first they get an award from IHDA stating they will give them tax credits, they then have to go out and sell those tax credits typically to financial institutions or large organizations that are looking to purchase tax credits; they have to find a buyer for those tax credits. Since the presidential election the value of a tax credit has gone from \$1.04 to .82 cents per dollar, and if President Trump has his way and reduces corporate taxes there is less of a need for corporations to buy those tax credits, so even if you have a coupon for a tax credit it could be worthless and if it is worthless they are selling that tax credit and taking the cash and using it as dollars to build their project. If that becomes as little value or too low a value and then don't have enough money to build their project, it could die; if they can sell their tax credit and they get enough money they still have another portion of the project that they have to go out and get private financing for. They go to the private market to get their private financing and might be unsuccessful in getting that as well. So there are 3 major steps before they can put the shovel in the ground. Aldr. Gaugel said it would be difficult and even more difficult under the current political environment to see this go forward as of today with the senior housing affordable element added to this. If that's the case and after the 3 years and asking for the fee of \$5,000 or whichever is less, if the Council reduces the fee structure on that, he can appreciate that, but he'd almost go the opposite direction and put a cap on it. If we do decide to go over there would reasons why we would do that at

that point in time; granted we just dropped drastically from \$4 million down to \$300,000 and he would say it would be the \$5,000 or what's in place at the time not to exceed a cap of 10% or 15% as opposed to going in the other direction. If it were to change then there'd be reasons why we would change it, it could be driven by the state or the affordable housing ordinance.

Aldr. Lewis said she is not sure she understands what affordable housing looks like, she understands they have to look the same on the outside but can look different on the inside, but yet the ones she saw didn't feel different on the inside than the other 600 being proposed to be built. The ones she saw had washer and dryers inside the units, granite countertops, stainless steel appliances and hardwood floors; they are all very lovely and nice they have them but she thought that's how money was saved by not building them out as extensively as the others. So if we have these units that are going to be the same size and have the same things as the ones being built, how are they called affordable. Mr. Patzelt said there are some significant differences in walking through their buildings and ours; for example the ceilings in the hallways are acoustical tile ceilings, no hardwood floors, no granite countertops, the units are smaller and have less amenities, and another big difference is they get this tax credit and funding incentive that is another funding source to them versus paying a larger debt service.

Aldr. Lewis said has asked 3 or 4 different people and she cannot figure out what the affordable rents would be and could Mr. Patzelt help her with that. She said she thought you take the median household income of Kane County and then somewhere between 30-60% of the median income, and it depends on Social Security as well. She said in Glendale Heights they were paying \$1,000 for these units and she's trying to get a handle on what these will cost in St. Charles. Mr. Patzelt said he did respond; in talking with Mr. Colby today and he asked if staff had replied to Aldr. Lewis. Mr. Colby said Kane County is part of the Chicago Metro area for purposes of calculating the actual affordable rent based on area median income; some counties in Illinois are in separate metropolitan areas so there are different calculations, but in Kane County we follow the Chicago area calculation. For a 1 bedroom, the 2015 maximum rent for 1 bedroom is \$855 and a 2 bedroom is \$1,026, and based on his communication with the developer, these are very similar to the rents charged at the Glendale Heights development, and subject to the same income restrictions. Aldr. Lewis said she thought Glendale Heights was \$700 and \$1,000, she wrote that down. Mr. Colby said yes, but they're very close.

Aldr. Stellato said he also had a chance to tour along with Aldr. Lewis and he felt the proposed senior housing concept was very well done and he welcomes it to St. Charles and thinks it would be a great addition. He noted that he was on the Council when the Housing Commission was first formed and discussions were had regarding some type of direction of where this money goes, but what we didn't consider back then was IHDA, which is out there today but was not before. We always talked about using the Housing Commission money to help supplement a purchase of a piece of property or some developer to help put in product that we need. In this case this property offers 2 opportunities for economic incentives to help get what we all want done here: it's in the TIF district, so we have some discretion hopefully with some bond money if there's anything out there, or if we have to go for an extension. The second is we do have the ability in the Housing Trust Fund to bridge a gap should the developer, who he met and seems very qualified, not be able to bridge the gap, and make it work perhaps due to the shift in funding or the ratio for the bonds or tax credits to be traded, maybe we can make up that difference, he's just throwing that out there, it's not definite, just something we might have an opportunity to step up and do that. He doesn't want to lose sight of what he thinks we saw or of what they are proposing because it's a great idea; the only thing is what happens if he doesn't build, what's the failsafe if the deal doesn't go through.

Chairman Bancroft said from his perspective 1.) The senior housing component was one of the more attractive components of this deal, 2.) The fee in-lieu is in our discretion, and he is not sure he would have ever been in the position where he would have given the fee in-lieu for a project at 600 units on that site, personally. 3.) The PUD is an agreement, so there is nothing to prevent the developer from coming back and saying the purchase agreement was terminated and right now you can't sell senior tax

credits and Mr. Patzelt is absolutely 100% correct, he has seen turmoil in both historical and low income housing tax credits since the presidential election. There's nothing to say that if this doesn't work, that they don't come back and we revisit where we are at with the PUD, but the risk that Council has is not being a fan of satisfying out Inclusionary Housing Ordinance by segregating it within a development, as well as the risk of not being able to intersperse those units among 600 units if they elect to go forward and start building while this is all influx and pending; we all have risk in a deal and there's no real way around that if they start building.

Aldr. Payleitner said she would be willing to take that risk and to revisit the PUD in 3 years then, but as its written now she would really hate for the Council to give up our discretion to require the units by agreeing to this, or our discretion to use a fee in-lieu.

Aldr. Lewis said she understands we are talking about inclusionary housing, but we don't even have any restricted just senior housing in it either, full rent restricted. Chairman Bancroft said he thinks that would be part of the PUD agreement. Aldr. Lewis said but it's not in there that we would want a building like that, is it. Mr. Colby said that's correct, however any of the residential units that are proposed in the project could be restricted to seniors, that's a choice the developer could make, that option is available. Aldr. Lewis said it's also something we could request. Mr. Colby said it is, but that's a different residential use category for an independent living facility development, where it's specifically limited to those 55 and older. Chairman Bancroft said right, it's not a restriction on it, but they have the ability with the PUD to do what they are suggesting. Aldr. Lewis said I think we need all types of senior housing. Aldr. Payleitner clarified that in 3 years if the affordable housing senior falls through then maybe we can make our own; 1 of those buildings could be senior restricted. Chairman Bancroft said yes we can revisit this at that point. Mr. Bazos said the trend here seems to be that if the fee in-lieu is not part of this arrangement, that we will wait 3 years and hopefully the senior housing comes through that would solve the issue; but if it falls through, in the meantime between now and 3 years the developer wants to start putting up buildings as quickly as the market will absorb them. So he'd start building mixed use and hopefully the retail along the front, which is not relevant to this conversation, but then some all residential buildings, but how do we comply with the requirement that affordable units must be scattered unless they are senior? He said in regard to Aldr. Payleitner wanting to take that risk and if we have to come back to discuss that, but Mr. Patzelt will have since built a number of buildings. Aldr. Payleitner clarified that she was willing to take the risk that perhaps we won't be able to scatter them. Mr. Bazos said we couldn't scatter them in buildings already built. Aldr. Payleitner said in 3 years all the buildings won't be built, that why she asked about the 10 years down the road.

John Hall-3980 River View Dr.-Housing Commission member-said he doesn't speak for everybody on the Housing Commission, but to us the opportunity to see the homes or units built is important regardless, whether its senior or affordable housing. He honestly doesn't see an issue with having it in 2 particular areas designated for the senior living, and if that's where the affordable living went, then that's where it goes. As a Committee, the rules have changed here a bit and as Chairman Bancroft mentioned, we need to take a look at those things and he doesn't think putting any extra burden on something that's just recently been approved is bad. He doesn't mind everybody in the same area, as long as the buildings look fine from the outside, which is what's always been the plan, he doesn't think that matters; just his opinion.

Chairman Bancroft said Mr. Bazos brings a real objective point in that if we start building apartments and 300 are built and the senior housing component doesn't happen, he doesn't think it's fair under an agreement with them under the PUD for us to say it has to be scattered throughout. Aldr. Payleitner said if he's to the point of no return, correct. Chairman Bancroft asked if it makes logical sense to scatter among the remaining 300, or as Mr. Hall said, to keep them where the senior housing would have otherwise gone; what are the right solutions at that point in time. He said we are almost drifting into answering hypothetical questions; we have an agreement in place and they are going for the senior

housing component and it seems that's been an important thing from this Committee's standpoint going forward. He thinks we get this done with a motion to approve subject to the resolution of staff comments and subject to this discussion and acknowledgement of the complexity of dealing with the senior housing component; he feels a motion like that probably could get us where we need to be.

Aldr. Lewis stated she had 1 other issue but didn't want to bring it up until the affordable housing issues were done being discussed.

Aldr. Silkaitis asked if we are at the motion that's going to come up eventually and what will that involve with the request; how will it be worded, because he doesn't not want the unresolved item in red in the motion, we can revisit again in 3 years, no problem, but he will not go with what they are requesting. Chairman Bancroft said he understands and suggested a motion to advance this on to City Council; motion to approve subject to the resolution of all outstanding staff comments, as well as subject to resolution with staff of the IHO issue as discussed with the Council here, which means we have to agree that it is not realistic for us to have a requirement that affordable units be scattered among a 600 unit development, if half of its been built, that's just a reality. He said reading the Committee right now it does not appear that anyone is ready to agree to any sort of fee in-lieu in the exercise of the Committee and/or Council's discretion; he doesn't think that's going to happen. He suggested right now approving the PUD subject to resolution of staff comments and resolution of the 2 IHO issues presented; first being the scattered among the development issue should the senior housing not go forward mid-development. The second issue being the percentage issue and a requirement in the ordinance; it's a threshold issue based on the percentage of market rate units constructed; if they build 50% of the market rate units, then there is a requirement that at least 30% of the required affordable units be constructed. They are stating that physically, because of the allocation of the 2 lots, that would be the senior housing component, these are artificial thresholds that don't necessarily fit the PUD. Aldr. Payleitner asked if we can do a variance on that as well. Chairman Bancroft said yes, subject to a waiver of those issues.

Mr. Colby stated that he thinks we could put in the ordinance draft that the remaining units would need to be distributed through the remaining buildings to be constructed, if that of the committees interest, or would they rather leave it more open ended to potentially be relocated. Chairman Bancroft said to him he feels it's better for both if we just look at it at the time, it may be unfair to say spread it around and he thinks the intent is to make it work.

Aldr. Turner asked if they are getting extra units because they are providing us with affordable units and what happened 3 years from now and we don't get them, and for whatever reason we give you a fee in-lieu instead, what happens to the extra units because you will not get them. Mr. Patzelt said he doesn't get them, the only way that you get the 10% bonus is if you actually provide the units, so if not provided then the maximum number on the site is 609, not 670.

Aldr. Lewis said haven't they already expanded those buildings and what if they have already built those. Mr. Patzelt said uniformly all the buildings have been expanded, in theory 10% to take up all of the additional units. So again he can only get to 50% for 300 of the units and then he has to provide the affordable, if he cannot get the affordable, now I have 300 units yet to build and the building on the plan will be shown as larger but will have to get smaller in the event he doesn't have to provide the affordable. Aldr. Lewis said but the ones you've already built will be the larger ones. Mr. Patzelt said correct, he will not be able to shrink the already built buildings. Aldr. Lewis said so here we are with these gigantic buildings. Mr. Patzelt said that's the problem. Aldr. Lewis said I know.

Aldr. Lewis said her other issue is a bike path on Rt. 38, and she's has talked and talked about it but never sees it and she was disappointed not to read it in the draft today because she thought she would see it, and there was nothing there addressing having a bike path. It might just be her standing on her soap box for it, but it's something if at all possible to compromise with to have some sort of path on Rt. 38 that will eventually connect all the way down to Peck Rd. where the swimming pool is so people can

get connectivity around this community. We just had a developer last week put a sidewalk back in and that is something very important to her and she guesses she hasn't said it publicly enough, so now she is and she would like to see that in the agreement as one of staff's outstanding comments that could be addressed. She doesn't know if we can do that, or how it works. Chairman Bancroft said right now that is not existing in staff comments and the motion encompassed existing staff comments, so the motion would have to be amended. Aldr. Lewis said she doesn't that that'll go anywhere. Chairman Bancroft asked the recording secretary if she had the verbiage of the motion down. Ms. Nilles replied it is on the tape.

Mr. Koenen asked that the motion be repeated for clarity.

**Aldr. Krieger left before the motion was made.*

Aldr. Stellato made a motion to recommend approval subject to resolution of all outstanding staff comments with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and the senior housing component as it stands acknowledging that should there be a situation where they have built part of the project and the senior housing development does not go forward, the Committee will revisit the scattered unit requirement; 1) we acknowledge that's an issue as a Council and 2) with respect to the artificial progress thresholds, those will be waived because they will be dealt with as part of the PUD. Seconded by Aldr. Turner.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Turner, Gaugel, Bessner, Stellato

Absent: Krieger

Nays: Lemke, Lewis

Recused:

Motion carried 6-2

4. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS-None.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION-None.

6. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, STAFF OR CITIZENS-None.

7. ADJOURNMENT- Aldr. Lemke made a motion to adjourn at 8:47 pm. Seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried. 8-0